

## REMARKS

The Examiner has alleged that the application includes three different species.

The Examiner has failed to put forth any reason for his election. MPEP §803.01 states that if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

"For purposes of the initial requirements, serious burden on the Examiner may be prima facie shown if the Examiner shows by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP §808.02. is required."

The Examiner has failed to show that separate classification, separate status in the art, or a different field of search is required. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to show any serious burden and must examine the alleged species.


In the event that the Examiner disagrees with Applicants' position, Applicants elect Species I (Figures 1-3, which relate to Claims 1-8, 10 and 12).

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 22, 2005

By:

  
W.R. Duke Taylor  
Reg. No. 31,306

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

WRDT/lkj